

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JUAN MATIAS TORRES,

No. C 12-06224 YGR (PR)

Petitioner,

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF  
TIME FOR PETITIONER TO FILE  
TRAVERSE; AND DENYING HIS  
PENDING MOTION**

v.

RALPH M. DIAZ, Acting Warden,

(Docket No. 10)

Respondent.

Petitioner, a state prisoner, filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The Court directed Respondent to file an answer to the petition and granted Petitioner leave to file a traverse within sixty-three days after the answer was filed. Respondent has filed an answer. Petitioner's traverse is due on August 21, 2013.

On June 13, 2013, Petitioner filed a motion entitled, "Motion to Grant Petitioner Confidential Calls as Pro Per." In this motion, Petitioner "requests confidential calls as [a] pro per five times per week." (June 13, 2013 Mot. at 1.) He has filed a declaration indicating that he "may be unable to provide a sufficient traverse" within the sixty-three-day time frame because of his limited access to the law library, his lack of phone access, and the prison's insufficient mail service. (Pet'r Decl. ¶ 1.)

Accordingly, the Court on its own motion GRANTS Petitioner an extension of time to file a traverse. Petitioner shall file a traverse no later than **September 20, 2013**.

In addition, the Court finds no good cause to order prison officials to provide Petitioner with telephone access to which he is not entitled otherwise. Therefore, Petitioner's "Motion to Grant Petitioner Confidential Calls as Pro Per" (Docket No. 10) is DENIED because he has not shown a sufficient reason for this Court to interfere in the day-to-day operations of the prison. *See Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 84-86 (1987); *Wright v. Rushen*, 642 F.2d 1129, 1132 (9th Cir. 1981) (courts should avoid enmeshing themselves in minutiae of prison operations in the name of constitution).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 10, 2013

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE